DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 045 VT 009 654

TITLE Vccaticnal Education and Manpcwer Training. Repcrt cf a Naticnal Legislative Seminar, September 7-9, 1969.

INSTITUTICN American Vccaticnal Asscciaticn, Washingtcn, I.C.

Pub Date Sep 69

Note 37p.

EDRS Price EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.95

Descriptcrs *Agency Role, *Ccnference Repcrts, Educaticnal Philosophy, Educaticnal Respcnsibility, *Federal Legislaticn, *Manpower Development, Role Cnflict, *Vccaticnal Educaticn

Abstract

The basic questicn cf where the responsibility lies fcr providing education and training for the Nation's labcr force has never been satisfactorily answered. Is it with educatic:n, labor, industry, or a combinaticn? Three bills intrcduced in Congress in 1969 prcmpted an invitaticnal ccnference by the American Vocaticnal Assciaticn (AVA), which was designed to study the backgrcund, the issues, the present legislative situaticn, and pcssible sclutions tc this question. A total of 300 delegates frcm 46 states and the District cf Columbia attended. Highlights cf presentaticns by representatives cf Congress, the Department cf Labcr and the Department cf Health, Educaticn and Welfare are presented in this repcrt, as well as summaries cf the reacticns cf discussicn grcups and their suggestions for Federal, State, lccal and AVA action. (CD)

VT009654

ED034045

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION and MANPOWER TRAINING

report of the
AVA National
Legislative
Seminar

o *When we separate education from manpower we create a dichotomy.*

o Funding of vocational education must be at least comparable to manpower funding.

o *A man must have more than a job.*

o State and local boards of education must develop strong comprehensive policy statements in support of vocational education and manpower training.

o *We have been frustrated by a lack of commitment in education.*

o State and local boards of education must develop strong comprehensive policy statements in support of vocational education and manpower training.

o *Effeciency of vocational education as a delivery system for manpower education and training has been proven.*

o Vocational education can train America's manpower.

o *Federal manpower laws should not prevent local school districts from carrying out their responsibilities for manpower training.*

o Education values of manpower training must be improved.

o *Vocational education must bear a much greater role in manpower education and training than it has in the past.*

o Keep your members of Congress informed.

ED034045

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND MANPOWER TRAINING

Report of a
National Legislative Seminar
Sponsored by
The American Vocational Association
Washington, D.C.
September 7-9, 1969

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION
1510 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

FOREWORD

The legislative seminar was called because vocational education and manpower training are faced with a critical legislative period. Also, the judgment of a large group was necessary in order for the Board of Directors of AVA to plot a course for the future with greater insight.

Forty-six States and the District of Columbia responded to the call for a legislative seminar and sent 300 delegates. This is by far the largest group in this history of AVA to give concentrated attention to urgent legislative problems.

The Washington office of AVA is responsible for representing vocational education and manpower training at the national level. In order to do this effectively it is necessary to keep a hand constantly on the pulse of vocational education. This seminar provided the American Vocational Association with a clear expression of new directions for the future.

C. Nelson Grote, President

Lowell A. Burkett, Executive Director

CONTENTS

	Page
Quotations	Cover 2
Foreward	i
Contents	ii
PROLOGUE	1
THE SEMINAR ISSUE	4
SOLUTIONS AS SEEN BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS	6
Highlights from Congressman O'Hara's Presentation	6
Highlights from Congressman Quie's Presentation	7
Panel Reactions and Replies	9
Highlights from Congressman Pucinski's Presentation	13
SOLUTIONS AS SEEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR	15
SOLUTIONS AS SEEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE	18
REACTIONS TO THE VIEWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	20
Dr. Weber Replies	21
Mr. Patricelli Replies	21
Comments by Micah H. Naftalin	22
REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUPS	23
Reactions of a General Nature	23
Reactions Related to the Federal Level	24
Reactions Related to the State Level	24
Reactions Related to the Local Level	25
Reactions Related to AVA	25
Reactions by Carl Elliott	26
THE POLITICAL ACTION QUESTION	27
SEMINAR OBSERVATIONS	28
EPILOGUE	29

PROLOGUE

The technological climate in the United States following World War II focused attention upon the Nation's program of vocational education and manpower training. A Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, appointed by President Kennedy in 1961, made a year-long study of the need for vocational education, and made recommendations which were reflected in the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

During the mid-60's riots and other forces brought out into full view the problems of the ghettos, of disadvantaged and handicapped persons, and similar social problems. Attention was focused upon the people that society had passed by, and a deliberate push was made to move people off the welfare rolls and into the productive economy.

A second national review of vocational education was undertaken by the Advisory Council on Vocational Education during the year 1967. This Council, a requirement of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, was appointed by President Johnson late in 1966. The Council's report was used by AVA and the Congress to produce the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

These two national reviews of vocational education, and the congressional acts which followed, represented a modern up-to-date interpretation of the basic principles of vocational education. Both reviews reinforced the basic commitment of vocational education to the people and to the labor force of the Nation, but upon a vastly expanded scale.

Although the Acts of 1963 and 1968 represented mandates to American education, the Congress did not provide sufficient funding. In 1963 the Panel recommended $400 million; the Congress and the Administration finally funded the program to a maximum of $265 million. The Council's report in 1968 requested $1.5 billion for the program of vocational education, but the Congress authorized $857 million—the President's budget for Fiscal Year 1970 contained an authorization of only $279 million.

Later, during the 91st Congress in 1969, the House of Representatives voted an additional $209 million in vocational education appropriations for Fiscal Year 1970. By the time of the AVA Legislative Seminar (September, 1969), this is the way things stood: the President's Budget for Fiscal Year 1970 contained $279 million; the House of Representatives approved an additional $209 million, which still awaited Senate action. Although the additional $209 million would help vocational education to tool up to its responsibility (under the provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968), it was by no means sufficient to meet the need for an expanded program of vocational education. The possible total of approximately $488 million was about half the amount Congress had recommended, and about 25% of the amount estimated by the Council.

Meanwhile, other forces had been at work. In 1962, the Congress passed the Manpower Development and Training Act as a retraining program to focus upon the critical needs of the unemployed. Later, amendments and changes caused MDTA to focus primarily on the problems of the hardcore unemployed and the disadvantaged. This Act was funded gradually to an amount of $421 million a year in Fiscal Year 1969, with an authorized appropriation of $650 million in Fiscal Year 1970.

It is interesting to note some comparisons in the funding of the two Acts:

Comparative Funding, FY 1968

	Number of Adults Served	Federal Expenditure
MDTA	300,000	$421 million
VEA 1963*	2,987,070	$ 10.8 million

*The total vocational education program enrolled 7.5 million persons with a Federal expenditure of $262.6 million.

It is more expensive to serve unemployed and disadvantaged persons, but the per student cost of $1,400 of Federal funds from MDTA, and $6 of Federal funds from vocational education shows a substantial investment in a program which is basically *remedial*, and an exceedingly low investment in a program which is basically *preventive*.

Other Acts were passed by Congress which resulted in competing programs and much confusion. No attempt was made to coordinate such programs but the need to do so was quite apparent.

Congress did react to the general problem of manpower training in 1969 by proposing three bills--H.R. 10908 (May 5, 1969) by Congressman Steiger (R-Wis.) and others; H.R. 11620 (May 26, 1969) by Congressman O'Hara (D-Mich.) and others; and S. 2838 by Senator Javits (R-N.Y.) and H.R. 13472 (August 12, 1969) by Congressman Ayres (R-Ohio) and others. These bills have the following titles:

HR 10908 To develop and strengthen a systematic National, State, and local manpower policy and provide for a comprehensive delivery of manpower services.

HR 11620 To assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work and to make available the education and training needed by persons to qualify for employment consistent with his highest potential and capability, and for other purposes.

S. 2838 To establish a comprehensive manpower development program to assist persons in overcoming obstacles to suitable employment, and for other purposes.

HR 13472 To establish a comprehensive manpower development program to assist persons in overcoming obstacles to suitable employment, and for other purposes.

Already in existence was the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress, which identified a comprehensive policy for vocational education in the Nation.

The American Vocational Association has had a long and illustrious history of interpreting needs for vocational education to the Congress of the United States. AVA's role has been recognized by the Congress because AVA has been able to reflect actual grass roots support for vocational education.

The legislative seminar reported here was essential in order that members of AVA, business, industry, labor, and the public at large could understand the facts about vocational education and manpower training.

The mandates to education, as expressed in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, represent a significant change in the scope, depth, and direction of vocational education. Whereas major efforts have been exerted by vocational education for the in-school programs, the Acts of 1963 and 1968 call attention to the needs of the disadvantaged, handicapped, and unemployed youth and adults who do not fall into the in-school group. This change of emphasis created a need to implement a new kind of total vocational education program in the various states and in the local schools. Involved also was a new kind of educational commitment to vocational education and manpower training.

The mandates required a new kind of leadership at the Federal level, a new comprehensive role for vocational education at the State level, and a strong commitment at the local level to take education to the community.

This brief treatment of the background for the legislative seminar suggests the need for, and value of, collective action—a pooling of the vast experience resource in vocational education and manpower training and in social and civic problems, to be directed toward a major conference issue.

THE SEMINAR ISSUE

Who Has the Responsibility to Provide Education and Training For the Nation's Labor Force?

Decisions about allocation of the responsibility to provide education and training for the Nation's labor force have been made in other periods of time. In 1917, with labor, business, industry, the Congress, and the community concurring, the responsibility was assigned to vocational education. This decision did not detract from the necessity of apprenticeship and company training programs. As the vocational education program expanded, the educational phases of apprenticeship were conducted as a part of the vocational education program, and company programs cooperated in a variety of ways with State educational agencies to expand the quality and quantity of their corporate training needs--many of which were satisfied by special adult programs in the vocational schools of the Nation.

The entire issue of who was to do the job of preparing the Nation's labor force was settled upon consideration of the following:

- The problem was *national* because of the mobility of labor.
- The responsibility was *public*, not private.
- The cost should be borne by the public.
- *Narrow* approaches were not satisfactory.
- The problem was broad guaged and *complex*.
- The Federal Government and the States (through their State Departments of Education) should be *partners* in the vocational education enterprise.
- Implementation was the responsibility of *local education agencies*.
- Within the framework of Federal legislation the States would determine the most appropriate programs in consultation with local districts and local communities.

The public educational system was the only institution of society through which a realistic vocational education program--preparing people for the work to be done--could be organized.

What about emergency situations? World War II is a good example. The Nation needed skilled manpower and the Congress looked to vocational education. *In less than 30 days the vocational education resources of the Nation were operating at full capacity, around the clock, every day in the year.* During the war period nearly eight million people were prepared to work in the labor force. The capacity of vocational education to meet

emergency conditions was tested and found to be thoroughly adequate.

During the early sixties when the question of responsibility to provide education and training for the Nation's labor force again came up for discussion, legislation assigned some responsibilities for retraining of workers to the U. S. Department of Labor. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 greatly expanded the provisions for vocational education and had been broadly conceived to include high school students, high school drop-outs and graduates, experienced workers who needed additional training and retraining, and other persons who were in need of training, particularly the disadvantaged.

W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, testifying before the General Subcommittee on Education, U. S. House of Representatives, on March 26, 1963, pointed out:

> "The Vocational Education Act of 1963 is a significant step in closing the gap between industry's need for training and the nation's present capacity to provide training. Also, the training provided would give individuals an opportunity to increase their employability and to build a good foundation of basic skill and knowledge that can be supplemented by any training that may become available to them in industry."

It became clear in the 1960's that the total task for the training of the Nation's manpower was a shared responsibility--the programs of the Department of Labor were directed at training and retraining of the hard core unemployed; the task of vocational education also included this group. In addition, a much larger task was evident--that of building stability into the social and economic structure so that large numbers of people would not require comprehensive remedial type programs organized outside the structure of education.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 have further improved vocational education's capability to provide, what Secretary Wirtz has called (in 1963) "a good foundation of basic skill and knowledge that can be supplemented by any training that may become available to them in industry."

In 1969, three bills have been introduced which appear to place many of the functions performed in vocational education under the administrative framework of the Department of Labor. Again, the basic question remains: "Who has the responsibility to provide education and training for the Nation's labor force?" Is it education, labor, industry, or a combination?

The AVA Legislative Seminar then invited into conference a number of people to look at the background, the issues, the present legislative situation, and to look for possible solutions.

SOLUTIONS AS SEEN BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Two Members of Congress, The Honorable James G. O'Hara, (D-Mich.); and The Honorable Albert H. Quie, (R-Minn.), discussed the need for manpower legislation and the merits of proposals presently before Congress. Following these presentations a Panel of Reactors--Dr. Joseph T. Nerden (North Carolina), Dr. Garth L. Mangum (Washington, D.C. and Utah), Dr. Cleveland Dennard (Washington, D.C.), and Dr. Rupert N. Evans (Illinois), discussed the presentations and raised questions about specific aspects of the proposed legislation.

Highlights from Congressman O'Hara's Presentation

- The proposed manpower legislation will help cure defects of the present manpower program. The need for manpower programs is evident, but slots have been unfilled, and funds unused, because a program was underutilized.

- What is needed is a Federal job creation effort, and the proposed legislation makes provision for a massive public service employment program.

- The welfare recipient is not going to be fooled into training without a job prospect.

- Nothing has been solved unless the manpower program finds jobs for people.

- Unless the manpower act makes provision for public service employment it cannot be called comprehensive.

- Industry must upgrade its entrance level employees so that the unemployed, at least, can move into the vacated entrance level jobs.

- Much of the training required to upgrade the skills of those in menial and dead-end jobs can be obtained in an institutional setting.

- Title I of the Manpower Act (H. R. 11620) makes provision for institutional training.

- Title II of the Manpower Act (H. R. 11620) provides upgrading training in an on-the-job setting.

- An impossible administrative structure has led to "buck passing," and the "buck" must stop someplace.

- The MDT Act authorizes the Secretary of Labor to have primary responsibility for referring people to a wide range of manpower services.

- Under the existing Manpower Development and Training Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has a secondary, although important, responsibility to provide institutional training to those who are referred for this program.

- Institutional training need not be provided entirely in public institutions. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should provide training directly, rather than through State agencies, if it can be done more effectively, quickly, and economically.

- We put into the Act a provision that no one public school, or private, State agency or proprietary school, have a monopoly on the provision of training.

- MDTA is a benefit to the ultimate consumer and recipient of manpower services--not another form of assistance to education, or a subsidy to State Employment Services.

- The maxim, "everybody's business is nobody's business," is vividly illustrated by trying to run a complex public program by committee.

- The criterion of success in the new manpower act will be the decision to invest authority and responsibility in one set of hands --it doesn't matter whose hands as much as that there is only one set involved.

- My bill selects the Secretary of Labor because, taking the whole range of manpower services and institutions, he and his department come closer to having the full range of expertise the program demands.

- My final criterion is that it confer accountability and commensurate authority on one identifiable official so that you will know whom to hold accountable.

Highlights From Congressman Quie's Presentation

- The Administration requested about $270 million for vocational education. Both the Johnson and Nixon administrations have not fully recognized the need in vocational education. In the manpower program we are talking about something over $2 billion.

- We have recognized the need for those who failed to secure the skills necessary for employment, and we are trying to meet those needs.

- We have not put the proper emphasis on preventing people leaving their formal education without skills--only 1 in 6 receive any kind of skill training from formal education.

- Providing remedial help costs more than giving preventive help in vocational education.

- It took us a shorter time to realize the need of a comprehensive manpower program than it took for us to realize the need of pulling together vocational education legislation.

- In vocational education we need to have an organization in the Federal Government. At present vocational education doesn't have a head because it is so far down in the administrative structure of the Office of Education.

- A slight upgrading of vocational education is evident in the present administration, but not to the extent that is really necessary.

- Programs have been given to one agency and then delegated to another. The Department of Labor has had more money delegated to it than has actually been appropriated to it for running the manpower programs.

- It is more important to learn a skill than it is to aim people toward college graduation.

- Vocational education has to bear a much greater role than it has in the past.

- We made an attempt in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 to consolidate programs and to put an emphasis on the training of teachers, research, and the development of residential schools. We increased the amount of money, which we thought would be acceptable at this time, doubling the first year.

- If we are going to do the job vocational education must be comparable to manpower programs in funding and in other ways.

- If everyone learned a skill it would eliminate many of the frustrations that exist among young people.

- Vocational education can play a great role in the manpower program by linking academic education and manpower training.

- I am convinced that we must bring education and manpower together in one Department. We should be striving for an interrelatedness between education and manpower.

- Vocational education must give relevancy to education by providing the opportunity for everyone to learn a skill while continuing formal education, and by giving assistance to remedial work.

- I believe that the first effort we ought to make is to see if vocational education can't do the job. Vocational education has

been modernized and is more relevant to the needs of people than ever before.

- We must not run a dual school system.

- It would be the height of irresponsibility not to set Federal policies and goals; vocational education has a responsibility to perform in these matters.

- There is no fear in vocational education of Federal Government participation.

- I believe that education and manpower can go hand in hand, providing opportunity for everyone to acquire jobs and skills and have the satisfaction of working in an area appropriate to his potential.

Panel Reactions

- Although the togetherness of the two Congressmen is commendable it is difficult to see how all of the recommendations are to be put into one package.

- On the basis on six years of manpower development and training it is suggested that only now has a way been discovered to train people and get them jobs. Vocational education has been doing this for over a half century.

- There is more to man than the will to work and produce. He has other aspirations, even if there is a job at the end of the training.

- When we separate education from manpower we create a dichotomy.

Congressman O'Hara Replies

-- It is important that a man have more than a job.

-- With respect to the separation between vocational education and manpower development it only makes sense that vocational education ought to be in the same general mix.

Congressman Quie Replies

-- The manpower program ought to be pulled into one agency, and the education part of it is important.

-- The Job Corps would have been better off had it been transferred to vocational education.

Panel Reactions, Continued

- It seems that we are trying to feel our way to the next step concerning employability and employment opportunities--all of the bills are trying to reach the next step.

- In all of the bills we seem to be seeking a functional rather than a programmatic approach, a community adaptability rather than a Federal pattern, and an "individual tailoring" instead of squeezing an individual into a particular program. We must be able to put all of the services together.

- There are several philosophical points around which differences will arise concerning the bills: (1) the differentiation between preventive and remedial programs, (2) the "instant job" versus long-range preparation, and (3) political responsibility versus professional autonomy. The real issue is, do we put the responsibility on the backs of the Governor, the Mayor, and the chief elected officer in each jurisdiction, or do we put the responsibility in the autonomous professional groups, the educators and the employment services?

- How would programs operate at the State and local level if the responsibility lay amongst the Federal, State, and local jurisdictions?

Congressman O'Hara Replies

-- I would recommend an open market approach, that is, give one Cabinet member the complete range of authority for whatever manpower development services are needed by any individual in the United States.

-- A basic unit could be the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. A Federally appointed official would be in charge of each of these areas (adjustments would need to be made so as not to leave out any geographical area) who would inventory the resources, determine labor force needs and employer requirements, and make arrangements with appropriate private and public agencies to provide whatever training, education, and other services are needed.

Congressman Quie Replies

-- The Federal Government's responsibility is to develop policy to meet National goals. It would be better to deal through the States and have the State develop a comprehensive program to meet the National goals.

-- Arrangements ought to be made between the states, whether MDTA, Job Corps, residential facilities, or facilities to be

developed. The need is to provide an opportunity for people to live at the site of their training, rather than at home.

-- No one is talking about taking power away from the Director of Vocational Education in each of the States.

Panel Reaction, Continued

o It is important that the Federal Government address itself to a national manpower policy that says, in effect, that if a person wants to develop certain competencies, regardless of what caused the need for change, an opportunity for employment is available.

o The first real problem is the economic one of matching a person with an existing job without requiring him to become a senior systems analyst in order to apply for a job.

o People in occupational education have no control over the jobs. Without a job, all that training guarantees is frustration.

o We should address ourselves to the problem of what can be done for people through public policy and economic capabilities to insure for them an improved quality of life. This is the central issue that we have to deal with before we decide who is to be in charge.

Congressman Quie Replies

-- The problem with project-by-project funding was that no one ever reviewed the project, there was no certainty of continuity.

-- We must be certain that the programs that are developed are what we think will be wise.

-- The Vocational Education Amendments required a State Council and a National Council, selected by the Governor and the President, so that we could avoid the "yes man." The idea was to bring in other individuals to participate in the determination of what kind of goals should be set--not only economic goals, but social and cultural goals as well.

Congressman O'Hara Replies

-- Dr. Dennard thinks that this program must be related to jobs and it ought to provide a job, or an opportunity for a job. I agree.

Panel Reaction, Continued

o The proliferation of unrelated manpower training programs simply

cannot continue.

- o We must have some method of identifying what programs are available, to meet what needs, for what people. We cannot continue with the situation where nobody, absolutely nobody, knows what is available in any one community at any one time, for any one person who needs services.

- o Some Members of Congress don't trust the States; they feel that the Federal Government must not only set National goals, but they must tell the States precisely how these goals are to be achieved.

- o It would be better for a State to make a determination how it would help to achieve a National goal, even though that determination might be in error, than to have one of the Cabinet Secretaries send a Federal employee to a major city to decide what Federal programs ought to be started and what Federal programs ought to be stopped.

- o It is not clear how the various bills will affect vocational counseling and provide freedom of vocational and educational choice for the individual. This is an extremely important and much underdeveloped aspect of vocational education.

Congressman Quie Replies

-- The Comprehensive Manpower program would not have anything to do with counseling or guidance, but under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 money can be used for the guidance complex.

-- If any Congressional intent or attitude was expressed it was that counseling and guidance ought to come prior to the secondary school.

-- I doubt that this is a problem for the Secretary of Labor, it should be left to the Secretary of Health, Education, and welfare to handle the way they handle vocational education.

Congressman O'Hara Replies

-- I don't want some employee in a Federal agency passing on the appropriateness of plans of State Departments.

-- It has been suggested that I am trying to make it possible to establish a dual school system. Ladies and gentlemen, *we've got enough trouble with one school system, and if I were going to establish a second one, I wouldn't let the Secretary of Labor run it. I don't have any intent of establishing a dual school system, none whatsoever.*

-- I don't want people making decisions on what needs to be

done for members of the work force, running these things and giving a preference to the ones that they run. I want decisions based upon the needs of clientele and finding the very best ways of getting them the training, placement, and counseling services they need. I think it can be done, but I don't think that we can do it by giving it to 50 States. We have to have somebody who isn't responsible to a particular constituency, a State or a city that's one part of a metropolitan complex. We must hav eone person in charge who is accountable to the people of the United States, with the responsibility and the authority he deserves.

Highlights From Congressman Pucinski's Presentation

Congressman Pucinski (D-Ill.), who has been identified as an aggressive proponent of vocational education, is the Chairman of the General Education Subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives. Congressman Pucinski spoke to the Legislative Seminar at its luncheon meeting on September 8, and the following points of view were adapted from his presentation.

- I have come to the conclusion that the last third of the twentieth century in American education belongs to the vocational educators--this is the salvation for our public school system.

- The great crisis in American education--and anyone who doesn't realize it is out of touch with reality--is that the schools are not really meaningful and are not producing the kind of education that parents want for their children.

- The 1968 Amendments brought us into a world of reality; they recognize a huge potential in vocational education.

- But there are troubled waters ahead. Some people would like to set up a competitive, or perhaps dual, educational system in this country.

- All sorts of forces are working, under the guise of expedience and improvement, to take away from you educators your fundamental responsibility.

- Present proposals before Congress are moving into the historical world of the educators.

- I would rather strengthen the vocational education system of this country and then perhaps pray that in five or ten years we won't need a manpower retraining program.

- If we had not treated vocational education as a stepchild over these many years we wouldn't need a manpower training program today. The $2.3 billion that we are appropriating could have gone in the normal channels of vocational education.

- We must realize that a worker, to meet the need of a twentieth century America, must have uncanny skills; skills that we're going to start developing in earliest childhood. You don't train "sudden workers" in the kind of economy we have today for the growing technology and the growing complexity of that technology.

- Let us begin with a good, strong, sound vocational education program and let's start at the earliest age.

- It shall be my purpose to try to point out to the House that the infraction upon the historical rights of the vocational educator will be a step backward at this particular time when we have finally begun to see some light.

- We are seeing at the State level and the Federal level a new awareness of the role that vocational education can play. Vocational education today is the key to our survival.

- I want you to know that the Congress has a high regard for you. You should be walking ten feet tall because the Vocational Education Amendments went through the House and the Senate without a single dissenting vote.

- The statistics we have about vocational education are probably going to show that most of the youngsters who complete a college education are those who had some exposure to vocational education before going to college.

- I would support legislation that would turn the whole job of manpower training to the State Vocational Education Departments.

- Let the vocational educator develop the whole concept. Let them take a hard look at the youthful population of their States. Let them look downrange at the manpower needs of their States. Let them tie in with the U. S. Employment Service and all its facilities. Let's get some computer technology into planning what we need.

- We can no longer afford to support the tragic situation in which most of our Nation's young people are total strangers to the world of work.

- Mr. Nixon said, "I'm not going to spend this money if the Congress appropriates it." Well, you just go back home and see about getting your money. I can't imagine any President having the authorization and being able to withstand huge pressure, particularly today when the needs are so great at the local school level. If I had a crystal ball I would predict that the Senate is going to do a little better than the House on the educational appropriation. We might even come a little closer to full funding for the vocational education authorization for 1970.

SOLUTIONS AS SEEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Dr. Arnold R. Weber, Assistant Secretary for Manpower, U. S. Department of Labor, discussed manpower legislation and provided a general rationale about relationships, intent, and responsibility related to comtemporary manpower programs and proposals. The following are excerpts from his presentation.

- The Labor Department has emerged as a parvenu in the area of manpower--indeed, manpower is a specific concept separable from other sorts of education and labor market activities.

- What we intended to do in the Manpower Training Act of 1969 was not to reorder all programs in all agencies impinging upon the development of manpower as a resource, but, rather, attempt to set our own house in order while engaging in a few renovations of the structure as it has developed.

- The Department of Labor for the past eight years has played an increasingly visible role in the manpower area.

- The new legislation introduced by the Administration presumes to clarify and refine that role as it relates to our own activities and as it relates to the activities of other agencies, specifically, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, welfare, and other areas.

- The law intends to refine and rationalize the system as it has developed--in many ways the Manpower Training Act, as proposed, is a gourmet speciality.

- We think the proposed law is important both within the framework of the Department of Labor activities and in that it provides for constructive collaboration with other agencies.

- I want to state flatly that we did not lust after the Job Corps. That foundling was left on our doorstep.

- The manpower program developed as three separate programs, one superimposed on the other.

  1. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, established for the first time manpower training, which consisted of training for specific jobs in specific companies largely on an on-the-job basis.

  2. The major commitment to manpower was the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which dealt with unemployment caused by technological displacement by giving to such persons new skills and providing for occupational mobility into new jobs. The law constituted a major legislative commitment to manpower training as contrasted to other forms of

investment in human capital, generally associated with the term education.

3. In 1964-65 the Economic Opportunity Act represented a response to essentially cultural and social goals, but included the development of work and experience programs.

- In rapid succession, 1961-1965, we had three different commitments to manpower in the sense of training people who are in the labor market, or who have moved out of formal educational institutions and are on the periphery of the labor market.

- The vocational education program began at that level with the Smith-Hughes Act, and was not changed until 1946, and then very rapidly again in 1963 and 1968.

- Our problems in manpower, both conceptually and programmatically, arise from three different commitments to manpower, reflecting different constituencies, different program goals, different funding arrangements, different bureaucracies, and different delivery systems, all superimposed one on the other.

- Problems have arisen from these programs as follows: First, a proliferation of categorical programs (about 30), which reflect different policy directions. This develops a rigidity in the use of funds--an emphasis upon filling slots rather than a mix of services which will accommodate the needs of specific individuals and specific communities. Second, there has clearly been a duplication of delivery systems. One is dazzled by alternative routes, each group with its own overhead, each group trying to carve out its own constituency, each group trying to differentiate its product in an effort to make a stake in a particular manpower area. Third, these programs have reflected almost exclusively Federal initiative and control, with very little effort to involve governmental units at the State and local level. Fourth, there have been few attempts to coordinate manpower programs with other major manpower institutions such as vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, and welfare programs. (The CAMPS program has been little more than a paper-stapling program.) This duplication has produced bureaucratic tensions inflamed over resources and very little in the way of successful effort to engage in coordination.

- The proposed manpower bill tends to deal with these problems and to remedy them. The bill:

1. Provides flexible funding for manpower programs by decategorizing all manpower programs except Job Corps. We want to delegate down the administration of the Job Corps to vocational education.

2. Provides for the decentralization of manpower programs to

the States and metropolitan areas as Governors and Mayors demonstrate an interest and administrative ability to plan and carry out manpower programs. This will be done in three stages of State and local apportionments.

3. Provides for a minimization of duplication by having unified prime sponsors at the State and metropolitan levels. There will be one State sponsor who, of course, can delegate out on a sub-contract basis, and there will be one metropolitan or local sponsor developed in each of the 233 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. They will have the responsibility for coordinating these efforts, for developing the appropriate delivery system, and for devising a plan that will be responsive to the needs of that particular community.

4. Provides a mechanism for the coordination of all manpower programs at the State level through the establishment of a State Manpower Planning Council which will include representatives of the manpower agency, vocational education, welfare, vocational rehabilitation, client groups, and labor and management.

5. Attempts to attain an equitable rural-urban balance in the distribution of funds.

6. Establishes manpower policies as a form of economic policy. Obviously, some of the funds will go to work-experience programs, but a great deal will go to institutional training programs because it is through such programs that a person can enhance his skills off the job and be in a better position to cope with business cycles.

7. Provides for maximum use of established manpower services. The bill contains a strong and unambiguous, "purchase of service" concept. Where other services are available the agency will use these services. The purchase of service plan represents and recognizes the laws of comparative advantage and the traditional interests of other agencies which exist.

o The relationship between vocational education and the Department of Labor is identified in a statement of purpose which says that the primary responsibility for preparing students for the world of work lies with the public and private educational systems. Obviously, in the real world, the distinctions between "in the labor market," "out of the labor market," "in the world of school," and the "world of work," are not always easy to devine. Nevertheless, the statement does tend to indicate who does what.

SOLUTIONS AS SEEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Robert E. Patricelli, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Interdepartmental Affairs, and Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Urban Affairs Council, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, discussed the general topic of Education's Role in Manpower. The following items have been gleaned from Mr. Patricelli's presentation:

- The Manpower Training Act was the occasion for us in HEW to review broadly the role of the Department in the manpower field.

- We were acutely aware of the fact that the relationships with the Department of Labor had been characterized by confusion, wrangling, and mistrust. The two Secretaries made it clear that they wanted these differences worked out.

- The Department of Labor made it clear that it was not attempting to use the Manpower Act to build an empire by pulling programs from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

- We have made a major effort to work out jurisdictional problems and to state some things about a rational division of labor between the two Departments and the two disciplines.

- We have identified six program areas which have important HEW and counterpart agency inputs and we will be spending a good deal of time in the coming months to develop our contribution.

- The State level jurisdictional problems were worked out largely by putting choices and responsibility in the hands of the Governor.

- The structure at the State level involves the creation of a Manpower Planning Council. The Council involves membership from all the relative disciplines and agencies within the State. And, perhaps even more important in the real world, there is a requirement that its staff similarly be made up of members representing the various disciplines that bear on manpower training.

- There are important protections for vocational education in the Act. It leaves to the Governor the question of whether or not he wishes, in constructing a comprehensive State Manpower Agency, to incorporate some or all of the vocational education function.

- The proposed Act states that the Secretary of Labor may not withhold funds by reason of a decision of the Governor not to include vocational education.

- The organization of a State Manpower Agency should be the occasion for a review of how best to organize the human services programs at the State level.

- It was the understanding of the Department of Labor all through the negotiation that vocational education probably should not be under the incentive system which would induce it to become more closely associated with manpower.

- Another element in the proposed Manpower Training Act is the attempt to move away from process-oriented legisation toward performance-oriented legislation. Now, if there is one thing that HEW is familiar with it's process-oriented legislation in the nature of State planning systems.

- It is possible that the legislative framework of the Manpower Training Act may prove useful in vocational education's future. It suggests some amendments that might be useful to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, although we do not have much to suggest in the way of the 1968 Amendments. Integration of some of the innovative areas of the cooperative work-study programs with some more of the general vocational education sections would provide State agencies with the authority to use funds as they see fit among their various programs and categories.

- The prevailing view in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administration, is that education and manpower are all part of the same spectrum of activity; they focus on the same goals, preparing people for life and for the world of work and for adulthood.

- In the general spectrum of shared responsibility between systems we have tried to proceed on a disciplinary division of labor which suggests that so-called preventive systems should be the purview of educational agencies and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the Federal level. Remedial programs are in the hands of manpower experts and the Department of Labor. The preventive and remedial distinction is embodied in the law in the purpose clause.

- The preventive aspects of manpower education have been comparatively disadvantaged within recent years in the budget. This is probably a consequence of the crisis atmosphere that has prevailed within recent years with regard to program policy formulation.

- We were not considering adequately the role of remedial programs. A cooling off in some of the crisis situations will make it possible to provide greater attention to preventive activity, particularly vocational education activity.

- We are already committed to the idea of the integration and cross-fertilization of general and vocational education.

- At the State level you will be well served by the Manpower Training Act, if enacted, through opportunities of the "purchase of service" authority.

REACTIONS TO THE VIEWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Four members of the seminar, J. Earl Williams (Texas), William F. Pierce (Michigan), Joe D. Mills (Florida), and Melvin L. Barlow (California), constituted a Panel to raise questions, make observations, and to suggest courses of action related to the presentations of Dr. Weber and Mr. Patricelli. The following items were typical of the general reaction of the Panel.

- In what way will the Administration bill contribute to the realization on the part of both agencies that they are a part of the total manpower decision-making mechanism, rather than separate entities?

- In what way will the structure of the new Act, or the administrative plans of the new agency, insure that the old bones of the skeleton of Employment Security will not rise again?

- In what way will the new Act move faster to meet objectives without building a separate power center so that we wind up with a duplication of two separate manpower systems? The present situation appears to do just that.

- Your past actions have spoken so loudly that it is difficult to hear what you are saying now.

- Accountability is a myth.

- The Act has been described as a "subtle" Act. It is this characteristic that makes us uncomfortable with it.

- The "track record" under MDTA causes a great amount of suspicion about what will happen under the new Act.

- The Secretary of Labor assumed more and more decision-making power under MDTA (apparently the Secretary of HEW abdicated his responsibility) which resulted in flexible programs, which we needed, and in change which we also needed. But, frequently these things came to us without anyone ever consulting the States to ask, "Is this the kind of a program you really need in your State?"

- How difficult will it really be for the State to reach the level of suggested perfection so that so that we will, in fact, get 100 percent of the funds and be able to do the kind of a job we want to do at the State level?

- How will this delivery system be improved at the State and local levels with the present staffing structure of the Bureau of

Employment Security at the State and local level, in terms of the quality and background of personnel, and the size of the organization?

- o We have seen the development of many new private organizations which are going into vocational education. Are we going to be by-passed in this legislation? Are we really going to develop a dual education system?

- o We have put a massive effort into remediation and practically nothing into prevention. Until we put a massive effort into prevention we will continue to create the forces that make it necessary to continue putting out fires.

- o Creating a new structure under the Governors and Mayors certainly doesn't sound much like building upon the existing structure.

Dr. Weber Replies

-- Our intentions are honorable. Institutional training is now operating below capacity. In our last budget-go-round we tried to sweeten up the institutional training component. We have resisted fragmentation and have insisted that some proposed programs go to the Manpower Development Training Centers which were established under the school system.

-- We are going to work with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other interested parties in an objective manageable way. Exemplary performance must establish goals and represent a consensus to which all of us as administrators in the manpower area can aspire.

Mr. Patricelli Replies

-- The Manpower Training Act for the first time really talks about joint administration of the State plan and the joint evolution of priorities and performance standards in exemplary programs.

-- There is a great deal to be learned from your fellow man on the other side of the fence. We ought to encourage and induce our people to go over and work for the other fellow for a little while to see what he has to offer.

-- The State Planning Council and the Governor's office are the keys to bringing the two systems together and forcing some links.

-- I would like to correct one misimpression suggested by the "reactors." We do not have a dual system, we have multiple systems; it would be an improvement to move to a dual system which, of course, is not our intent.

-- The manpower system has to have fall-back authority in basic education which they will use in a purchase-of-service way under the proposed comprehensive Act. I see no spectre of a duplicative general education system growing at all.

Comments by Micah Naftalin, General Counsel for AVA

-- Despite the variety of options available to coordinate the vocational education program with the manpower programs it would seem appropriate to use the planning unit (the State Advisory Committee) which was created by the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. This committee was appointed by the Governor and its existence should not be overlooked.

-- The name of the game is to provide all persons in this country with the necessary education and training to permit them to survive in the world of work--this goal is stated in almost identical terms, at least substantially so, in both the manpower and the vocational education legislation.

-- All Administrations have paid lip service to vocational education but they have cited low budgeting priorities.

-- Vocational education is a tiny Bureau in HEW and must compete with all other units in that agency for funds. Manpower is the prime mission of the Department of Labor and receives first priority in budget negotiations.

-- In the Councils of Government the manpower spokesman is the Secretary of Labor; vocational education's spokesman is a Bureau Chief.

-- Vocational education has a strong position in the Congress and the Congress invariably raises the Administration's budget request for vocational education.

-- The House of Representatives has just acted by almost doubling the appropriations for vocational education. This must now go through the Senate and then avoid a Presidential veto, or a refusal to spend the increased funds.

-- With respect to the manpower program in the Department of Labor we have a few cards, but no trump cards, which was one of the reasons this conference was called.

-- The three bills have essentially the same objectives, none makes substantial additions to programs already authorized, the major change is the mechanism of the delivery system of those objectives--none of the bills affects the vocational education program in any respect.

-- We are alarmed that the manpower programs receive several

times the money vocational education receives and serve only a fraction of the number of prople vocational education serves.

-- The Department of Labor received its hunting license to poach on educational preserves in 1962. The time to change the manpower program and its delivery system is at hand.

-- We have three options: (1) stand on the *status quo* and oppose the bills, (2) stand aside and let others assume the total responsibility to change the system, or (3) assert ourselves and bring educational values into the process of affecting change. I would hope that we would choose the last one.

-- I fail to see how we can, with any intellectual consistency, fight for educational values in vocational legislation and at the same time refuse to insist on the same educational values in the conduct of manpower training.

-- The MDTA institutional training, and the skill centers, both manned largely by vocational educators, provide a far better quality of instruction at a vast cost reduction. We can and do reach trainees in smaller cities and rural areas as well as the large cities. Despite this evidence, the Manpower Administration provided in Fiscal Year 1970 for a dramatic increase in the JOBS program and a decrease in MDTA institutional funding.

REPORT OF DISCUSSION GROUPS

Following the presentations by Members of Congress, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the total seminar was divided into seven discussion groups. These groups were asked to react to the presentations and to make suggestions for action. The reactions of the 300 persons attending the seminar are summarized.

Reactions of a General Nature

Vocational education has always been involved in manpower training--this is one of its basic reasons for existence. This fundamental concept was broadened by the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and by the Amendments of 1968. The commitment was definitely directed toward a deeper and broader involvement in manpower training needs. The primary concern now, as it has always been in the past is a concern for the welfare *of* the individual, not welfare *for* the individual; the focus is upon broad social problems.

Vocational education was developed as a part of education and it should remain as a vital part of education. A vast store of capability and experience is available in vocational education to develop additional

skills needed in manpower training; this range of capability extends, in the life of man, from the cradle to the grave.

The seminar, as it looked at the problem of manpower training, seemed to say with one voice that the emphasis should be put on *prevention* aspects, but not to the exclusion of *remedial* aspects. The large proposed investment for remedial manpower programs tends to diminish, or rule out, investments in solutions to critical manpower problems.

A general reform in education is needed, with vocational education taking the lead by supplying the "cutting edge" in career development. As a part of this general reform the need for manpower programs, articulated to emphasize long range goals of development, is recognized as a distinct part of vocational education and is consistent with the new vocational education amendments. By any comparison vocational education has served more of the labor force than has the present manpower program.

Present manpower bills tend to take on responsibilities which should logically belong to education, public and private; it would only be a matter of time until the manpower legislation would include the vocational education acts and programs. A strong position standpoint should be taken by vocational education to retain completely the educational phases of manpower programs--only *education* is geared properly to do this job. Business and industry have a long history of cooperative effort with vocational education and have used such services successfully to develop their employees. The Department of Labor has a large and important role to play in the manpower scene, but not in a take-over of the educational phase.

Reactions Related to the Federal Level

In response to manpower needs Congress has produced an array of conflicting programs which ignore existing successful institutional programs. The depth of confusion and mismanagement of the manpower problem cries out for order at the Federal level.

Among the variety of ideas, opinions, and points of view of the seminar related to action at the Federal level are the following items. Rank order of importance is not attached to the list.

- Amend the O'Hara and the Administration bills to require the Secretary of Labor to contract with State Boards for Vocational Education for all education and training including arrangements with non-public agencies.

- Create a separate Cabinet post including vocational education and all other programs leading to employability; the agency to have full authority for all vocational education funds and related activities.

- Provide for full funding of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

- Develop a flexible State plan to encompass all vocational education and manpower education programs.

- The Bureau of the Budget has ignored the need for vocational education and does not support adequate funding.

- Present status of vocational education in the Office of Education makes it nearly impossible for vocational education leadership to develop at the Federal level.

Reactions Related to the State Level

A number of strengths and weaknesses concerning the vocational education program have developed at the State level, and to a considerable extent at the local level, which have aided and detracted from the general development of vocational education.

Among the strengths are: (1) sharing of ideas, (2) meeting community needs, (3) continuous evaluation through advisory committees, (4) educational provision for general education's failures, (5) a relationship to the total educational spectrum including curriculum development, evaluation, integrated vertical curriculum placement, in-service education, supervision, and other items directly related to the total development of the individual.

Among the weaknesses are: (1) failure to meet special needs of youth, (2) lack of facilities and obsolete and inadequate facilities, (3) lack of relevant couseling and guidance programs, (4) pressure of outside influences, (5) domination by educational generalists, (6) obsolete leadership and inadequate staff, (7) inadequate financing, and (8) inadequate follow-up studies and public information about vocational education. In addition, the following items appeared in the general consensus:

- State and local boards of education should make a definite commitment concerning vocational education within the educational structure.

- The responsibility for vocational education and the educational component of MDTA is a function of the State.

- State groups of business and industry must be involved in the general planning and review of vocational education.

- Labor and vocational education work extremely well together (some States better than others, of course); action at the Federal level must not destroy these effective relationships.

- A common State committee for vocational education and manpower education should be formed in order to carry out a comprehensive manpower policy which does not duplicate efforts under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

- AVA State associations must be strengthened because of the nature of the New Federalism of the President.

Reactions Related to the Local Level

The seminar supported the traditional view that education is a national *concern*, a *function* of the State, and a local *responsibility*. In the final analysis, whether or not a program works depends upon what actually takes place at the local level. Federal and State action concerning vocational education and manpower training must consider the implementation of the program at the local level.

A definite campaign with local school superintendents for full support of vocational education appears to be essential. Vocational education can not let itself be boxed in as a secondary school program only; the total responsibility is broader than the confines of the secondary school.

Efficiency of the present vocational education delivery system, working ultimately through the local schools, has been proven time after time; the educational component of manpower programs must follow this tested practice. National contracts have frequently "parachuted" manpower programs into the local situation without regard for existing facilities.

Programs of vocational education need to be expanded in both range and depth, and made generally more available, in both the secondary and post-secondary schools, and with a generous emphasis upon the programs for out-of-school youth and adults.

Reactions Related to AVA

For more than a half century vocational educators have looked to their national professional organization for leadership, guidance, and action--action particularly related to vocational education at the national scene. It was not surprising, therefore, that the discussion groups made many action suggestions for AVA. Because of the work of AVA the image of vocational education has been excellent in the halls of Congress, and the Congress has placed value upon the testimony and points of view of key vocational educators who have been recommended by AVA. Thus, the seminar directed a number of suggestions to the AVA Board of Directors, as follows:

- Push immediately and vigorously for full funding of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

- Form a close alliance with other professional groups to provide a united front.

- Stimulate action to upgrade vocational education in the Office of Education.

- Urge State and local groups to keep their Members of Congress informed about vocational education.

- Study the alternatives for change in the nature of the present delivery system for vocational education.

- Safeguard the institutional phases of manpower training.

- Continue to move toward direct Presidential support and appropriate funding from the Bureau of the Budget.

- Oppose setting up *new* advisory committees under the Governor, and/or Mayor--utilize existing committees.

- Develop and support legislation (possibly by amendments to VEA '68) for broad programs of vocational education (occupational education) instead of remedial programs.

- Urge the formation of a single agency at the Federal and State levels for all vocational education and the education phases of manpower training.

- Embark upon a massive informational campaign about vocational education.

- Keep membership informed about *action* schedules related to legislation.

- Improve the fiscal structure of AVA in order to provide more services to members and improved information for Members of Congress.

- Oppose the potential threat of a take-over by the Department of Labor, and the complete apathy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by acting as a catalyst so that vocational education and manpower programs may flourish and each agency perform a unique role.

- Encourage development of realistic labor demand data (Department of Labor) to be matched with realistic labor supply data from vocational education (Department of HEW).

- Vocational education has trained, and can continue to train, America's manpower.

Reactions by Carl Elliott, General Counsel for AVA

-- This is the most productive series of meetings I have ever had the privilege of attending.

-- The most effective lobbying is done at the grassroots of America, in the precincts, towns, rural areas, counties, and cities of the Nation. It isn't done here on the Potomac.

-- Members of Congress have a strong and favorable feeling from

their constituents about vocational education and manpower training. These programs require massive action in the States and local areas.

-- AVA's efforts with Congress and the policy-making departments of Government are excellent, respected, and represent an up-to-date information source.

-- Vocational education is a vast organization that stands for principles that will give America the life and direction it must have as we finish the decades of this century.

-- The wonderful possibilities before us give us the challenge we need as we look forward to a bigger job in the future and the determination to grasp and embrace the opportunities ahead.

THE POLITICAL ACTION QUESTION

At various times during the seminar the question of a political action arm came up for discussion. Seminar participants were aware that some Members of Congress had reacted to the manpower needs of the Nation by promoting bills, with enthusiasm, which constituted a threat to the further development of vocational education. They were aware also that these attitudes in Congress may have been stimulated by strong "outside" support. It was logical for some members of the seminar to support strongly a similar move on behalf of vocational education, and they looked to AVA as the vehicle for such action.

The need for political action was one question, but the involvement of the American Vocational Association in this action was quite another question. Throughout its long history AVA has maintained a professional approach to Congress and has dealt in facts that represent, insofar as possible, a consensus across the Nation. In a large part, the Congress has placed value in such information from AVA because of its nonpolitical nature.

AVA is not constituted to act as a political unit and at the same time maintain its integrity as a professional association. The idea of AVA's involvement in any political action venture must be rejected. If political action is needed it is not within the province of AVA to plan, support, or carry out any kind of political involvement.

On the other hand, the American Vocational Association believes strongly that all Members of Congress should have first-hand information (actual knowledge gained by visitations and other experience) in order to have an experience background about vocational education. Only when Members of Congress have actual knowledge about vocational education in their district and in their State can they have a basis upon which to act for the common good. AVA will continue to urge its members, as it has in the past, to provide opportunities for Members of Congress to see vocational education

programs in operation so that their judgment about matters concerning vocational education and manpower training can be approached realistically.

SEMINAR OBSERVATIONS

Dr. Martin Hamburger, Head, Division of Vocational Education and Applied Arts and Sciences, New York University was assigned the responsibility of reporter and reviewer of the process of the legislative seminar. Dr. Hamburger's report cited aspects of the total group action, its strengths and weaknesses, and its oversights. The following items are taken from his final report.

- Both in process and content a tremendous amount of development and change occurred in two days.

- This was truly a seminar in terms of information exchanged, a workshop in terms of grappling with ideas, and a group experience in terms of change.

- As the seminar progressed people seemed to change from indifference to ambivilance, and then to active involvement.

- Although few people were totally indifferent or hostile, the total group did change.

- We were fortunate in having five well informed on-the-line authorities--three Members of Congress and two members of the Executive Branch--to take away the mystique of the great difference between ourselves and the top decision makers.

- In addition to getting information there was a considerable amount of inspiration--a feeling of commitment, concern, and leadership.

- There were some aspects of backpatting and congratulations, particularly in relation to the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, which was passed unanimously by Congress, and which shows how highly we are regarded by the Congress.

- In one sense, the Act of '68 is a criticism, indicating what we haven't done and what we must develop the leadership to do. Our task is more than delivering what we have delivered so well in the past. We must have some emphasis upon what we haven't done well and be somewhat cautious about overemphasizing what we have done.

- Impending legislation is a good starter-upper. With definite bills in hand the seminar felt they had something to do. The mood ranged from resignation-to-the-inevitable, to active combat against the enemy, with final constructive action emerging. A sense of reality developed involving long-range negotiation

rather than dealing with an emergency or crisis.

- Although we had excellent guests and information givers, we did not have informed critics.

- There was a minimum of scapegoating. To an extent we blamed funding lags, misunderstanding in general, and academic educators for some of our problems, but in several of the discussion groups we turned to constructive ways of approaching the things that have not been done.

- A basic sense of realism prevailed during the seminar.

- The laundry lists of things to be done are not as constructive as the development of priorities and selected targets.

- We must gear ourselves to the development of social inventions which arise in the face of crisis and emergency situations. We must comment on social inventions which have been injected into the system, be constructively critical of such inventions, and participate in improved program development.

- A commitment for manpower development for educators means a more extensive movement of education into the community at large

- We must work with competition and rivalry and not freeze out all persons who want to work in the vineyard.

- There was little discussion or concern about a key problem, that of the fantastic shortage of skilled and competent staff and other personnel needed to do many of the jobs.

- We have an unfinished system of education in this Nation. We must work together in long-range planning, avoid becoming remedials, and work toward becoming a preventive and developmental group.

EPILOGUE

America has developed a depth of concern during recent years about the plight of people--a concern backed up by extreme determination and accentuated by Congressional action. The Nation has been up in arms about its social problems and has developed a range of commitment from the highly talented members of society to those who have fallen through the cracks of the social structure; but contemporary emphasis has been placed upon the latter group.

For more than a half century the official burden of preparing people for the labor force has been vested in the Nation's vocational education program. This program has served the Nation well and today involves a total of eight million people, of which nearly three million are the

youth and adults,employed and unemployed, who are part of the labor force.

Less than a decade ago an emergency problem of retraining displaced workers was assigned to the U.S. Department of Labor. Later this responsibility was increased to include persons who were unemployed and disadvantaged. In the Congressional mill at the moment are proposals which would invite the U.S. Department of Labor into a vast expansion of manpower training. The manpower training programs, under MDTA, have produced a number of exemplary gains, and some colossal failures. The total number of persons trained under MDTA has not exceeded 300,000 per year--about 10 percent of the comparable group (adults and persons with special needs) reached by vocational education.

It is true that the manpower training program has reached a number of persons that vocational education, prior to 1963, was not in a position to reach. No one doubts the necessity of an expanded manpower training program. The dichotomy exists in the unresolved question of division of responsibility between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the proposed manpower legislation the structure of vocational education has been ignored. Only in a minor way has the potential of vocational education risen to the surface in the proposed legislation. It is imperative that the Department of Labor recognize that vocational education has a proven capability to resolve manpower education problems effectively.

During the last decade the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has exhibited an apalling lack of responsibility for the educational components of manpower training. Seemingly, the Department has been content to abdicate its responsibility. This situation is evident in a number of ways, two of which are obvious. First, the location of the administrative head for vocational education and manpower training, in the organizational structure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is extremely low when compared to the organizational location of manpower administration in the Department of Labor. The comparison is that of a Bureau Chief with an Assistant Secretary. These differences in administrative structure force persons in the Secretary's office of Health, Education, and Welfare who are not well informed about vocational education to coordinate administratively with the Department of Labor. Second, the financial support for vocational education, under the administrative structure of Health, Education, and Welfare has fallen far short of the recommendations of Congress and the considered judgment of previous advisory councils on vocational education. The fact is that there is no one in the top structure in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who has a basic commitment to, and responsibility for, vocational education. Consequently, the rationale for vocational education, its potential in manpower training, and its financial needs get lost, or distorted, as it passes up in the administrative structure.

The evidence seems to show that both the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are deeply concerned with the problems of manpower education and training. It is further evident

that both Secretaries want their respective departments to provide a unique contribution to the solution of the problems of vocational education and manpower training. The Secretaries are backed by a dynamic Congress committed to serving the American people better.

Somehow all of these loose ends must be tied together. The job of vocational education and manpower training must be undertaken with renewed vigor. The end results are imperative in developing and maintaining a healthy economy. The task can neither be resolved upon the basis of creating new structures, nor upon the basis of abdicating responsibility.

It is quite possible that the present Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 need even further revision, and it is highly probable that proposed manpower bills need adjustment so that objectives can be reached without further complication and confusion of the problem. There is no doubt, however, that all who have concern in the area of manpower education and training need to reexamine their positions, and to look to the future without malice or vindictiveness, but with a new commitment for the common good.

Vocational education and manpower training are elements in the same series, and for the most part are not separable. The American Vocational Association called the legislative seminar for the purpose of getting the task squarely in front of those who are concerned and who are in a position to help reach appropriate solutions.

In the final analysis the Congress must make some decisions about the issues defined at the Seminar. It is imperative that the vocational education profession exert leadership in this effort to bring vocational education and manpower training to all persons of all ages of all communities.

* *
* The speeches and reports presented at the *
* Legislative Seminar were tape recorded *
* and, in an edited version, form the basis *
* for this report. The contents represent *
* our editorial judgment on the information *
* presented and it is our hope that we have *
* closely adhered to the main thoughts of *
* the speakers and panel members. *
* AVA Staff *
* *